



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,491	11/14/2005	Heikki Waris	884A.0093.U1(US)	9069
29683 7590 09/04/2008 HARRINGTON & SMITH, PC 4 RESEARCH DRIVE SHELTON, CT 06484-6212				
EXAMINER				
LEE, ANDREW CHUNG CHEUNG				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2619				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
09/04/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/531,491

Applicant(s)

WARIS, HEIKKI

Examiner

Andrew C. Lee

Art Unit

2619

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 April 2005.
2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-31 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 4/15/2005 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/CIS)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/15/2005
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This Office Action in response to the Application no. 10531491 filed on 4/15/2005 is entered.

Claims 32, 33, 34 have been canceled by Preliminary Amendment dated 4/15/2005.

Claims 1 – 31 are hence entered and presented for examination.

Priority

2. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Information Disclosure Statement

3. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 4/15/2005 was filed, and the submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

4. The drawings (Fig. 1A, Fig. 1B, Fig. 1C) are objected to because the two rectangular boxes connecting the networks VPN 102a, 132, and VPN 104a are not labeled with text and are not numbered. The boxes are not described clearly in the disclosure. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended

replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) because they fail to show explicitly and clearly the claimed limitations of "means for automatically changing the point ...", and "transfer means for" as described in the specification. Any structural detail that is essential for a proper understanding of the disclosed invention should be shown in the drawing. MPEP § 608.02(d). Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be

removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Specification

5. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because the abstract of the disclosure does not commence on a separate sheet in accordance with 37 CFR 1.52 (b)(4). A new abstract of the disclosure is required and must be presented on a separate sheet, apart from any other text. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Refer to page 9, the acronym "AAA" should be spelled out in full text.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 1 – 31 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding claim 1, the claimed subject matter "the network" in line 3, should be corrected as "the virtual private network " or "said virtual private network"; "the point" in

line 8 should be corrected as "a point"; "the internal portion" in line 9 should be corrected as "the internal secured portion" or "said internal secured portion". Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding claims 1 – 27, the claimed subject matter "a network" as stated in the preamble should be corrected as "The virtual private network" so as in consistent with the limitation claimed in Independent claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding claim 5, the claimed subject matter "the internal portion" in line 4 should be corrected as "the internal secured portion" or "said internal secured portion" so as in consistent with the limitation claimed in Independent claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding claim 13, the claimed subject matter "the internal portion" in line 3 should be corrected as "the internal secured portion" or "said internal secured portion" so as in consistent with the limitation claimed in Independent claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding claim 15, the claimed subject matter "the internal portion" in line 3 should be corrected as "the internal secured portion" or "said internal secured portion" so as in consistent with the limitation claimed in Independent claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding claim 17, the claimed subject matter "the internal portion" in line 4 should be corrected as "the internal secured portion" or "said internal secured portion" so as in consistent with the limitation claimed in Independent claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding claim 25, the claimed subject matter "the internal portion" in line 2 should be corrected as "the internal secured portion" or "said internal secured portion" so as in consistent with the limitation claimed in Independent claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding claim 27, the claimed subject matter "the internal portion" in line 2 should be corrected as "the internal secured portion" or "said internal secured portion" so as in consistent with the limitation claimed in Independent claim 1. Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding claim 28, the claimed subject matter "an internal portion" in line 3 should be corrected as "an internal secured portion", and "the internal portion" should also be corrected "the internal secured portion" or "said internal secured portion" so as in consistent with the claimed limitations by the other claims, and "the point" should be corrected as "a point". Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding claim 29, the claimed subject matter "the internal portion" in line 6 should be corrected as "the internal secured portion" so as in consistent with previous claimed limitation. Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding claim 30, the claimed subject matter "the internal portion" in line 3 should be corrected as "the internal secured portion" so as in consistent with previous claimed limitation. The claimed subject matter "A mobile workstation" should be corrected as "The virtual private network", and the ";;" at the end of the second gateway should be replaced with ".". Appropriate correction is required.

Regarding claim 31, the claimed subject matter "the internal portion" in line 3 should be corrected as "the internal secured portion" so as in consistent with previous claimed limitation. The claimed subject matter "A mobile workstation" should be corrected as "The virtual private network", and the ";;" at the end of the second gateway should be replaced with ".". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is not clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that what is being claimed by the applicant "means for", since no function is specified by the word(s) preceding "means," it is impossible to determine the equivalents of the element, and the claimed subject matter "means for ..." does not describe clearly and explicitly in the specification and the limitation also does not show or illustrate clearly in the drawing.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is not clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that the claimed subject matter "a gateway" is referred to the first gateway or to a new gateway. Clarification is required.

Claim 4 recites the limitation "the home address" in lines 1 – 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 11 recites the limitation "the address of the second gateway" in lines 2 – 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 17 recites the limitation "the location of the mobile station" in lines 2 – 3. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is not clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that the claimed subject matter "the gateway" is referred to the first gateway or to a better gateway. Clarification is required.

Claim 20 recites the limitation "the care-of-address" in lines 1 – 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 28 recites the limitation "the route" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 29 recites the limitation "via the first secure communication means" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is not clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that what is being claimed by the applicant "means for", since no function is specified by the word(s) preceding "means," it is impossible to determine the equivalents of the element, and the

claimed subject matter "means for ..." does not describe clearly and explicitly in the specification and the limitation also does not show or illustrate clearly in the drawing.

Claims 30, 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is not clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that what is being claimed by the applicant "means for", since no function is specified by the word(s) preceding "means," it is impossible to determine the equivalents of the element, and the claimed subject matter "means for ..." does not describe clearly and explicitly in the specification and the limitation also does not show or illustrate clearly in the drawing.

Claims 30, 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 30 and 31 appear to be an apparatus, which should constitute device or apparatus; however, the claims are dependent upon independent claim 1 which claimed a virtual private network. It is not clear to one of ordinary skill in the art that what is being claimed by the applicant is it the claimed subject matter "a virtual private network" or "a mobile workstation". Clarification is required.

Claim 30 recites the limitation "the identifier of the second gateway" in line 4. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

8. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

9. Claims 1 – 13, 15, 17 – 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kakemizu et al. (US 20020018456 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Kakemizu et al. disclose a virtual private network including an internal secured portion which connects via at least a first gateway and a second gateway to an external portion (Fig. 2, "element 21 VPNGW(FA)" interpreted as a first gateway, "element 31 VPNGW(HA)" interpreted as a second gateway, "VPN of IP sec." interpreted as internal secured portion, "public IP network" interpreted as an external portion; Fig. 2, paragraph [0017], Fig. 25, paragraphs [0113]), the network comprising: a plurality of workstations including at least one mobile workstation in the external portion ("element MN 1" interpreted as at least one mobile workstation in the external portion; paragraph [0017]); the first gateway (Fig. 2, "element 21 VPNGW(FA)" interpreted as the first gateway; paragraph [0017]); the second gateway (Fig. 2, "element 31 VPNGW(HA)" interpreted as the second gateway; paragraph [0017]); and means for automatically changing the point through which the mobile workstation communicates with the internal portion of the network from the first gateway to the

second gateway, in response to movement of the mobile workstation (Fig. 5, paragraph [0113]).

Regarding claim 2, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed further comprising transfer means for transferring context information usable by a gateway in communications with the mobile workstation, to the second gateway (Fig. 25, paragraphs [0114], [0115]).

Regarding claim 3, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the context information includes an identifier of the mobile workstation ("care-of-address" interpreted as context information includes an identifier of the mobile workstation; paragraphs [0004], [0100]).

Regarding claim 4, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the identifier is the home address of the mobile workstation ("home address"; paragraphs [0004], [0100]).

Regarding claim 5, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the context information includes material for defining secure communication means by which information is transferable securely between the mobile workstation in the external portion of the network and the internal portion of the network, via the second gateway (paragraphs [0017], [0024], Fig. 2, Fig. 27).

Regarding claim 6, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the secure communication means is a security association pair between the second gateway and the mobile workstation (Fig. 27, "position registration request message (HAR), and "position registration response (HAA)" interpreted as secure communication means is a security association pair; paragraphs [0128], [0129]).

Regarding claim 7, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the transfer means is physically separate from the first gateway ("element 23 AAAF" interpreted as the transfer means; Fig. 27, paragraphs [0127], [0129]).

Regarding claim 8, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the transfer means additionally transfers information to the mobile workstation for enabling communications between the mobile workstation and the second gateway (Fig. 27, paragraph [0129]).

Regarding claim 9, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the information transferred to the mobile workstation enables secure communication means by which information is transferable securely between the mobile workstation in the external portion of the network and the internal portion of the network, via the second gateway ("elements "Reg Req 1, and Reg Rep 8 and authentication request message ,

AMR" interpreted as the information transferred to the mobile workstation enables secure communication means; Fig. 27, paragraphs [0127]-[0129]).

Regarding claim 10, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the secure communication means is a security association pair between the mobile workstation and the second gateway (Fig. 27, "position registration request message (HAR), and "position registration response (HAA)" interpreted as secure communication means is a security association pair; paragraphs [0128], [0129]).

Regarding claim 11, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the information transferred to the mobile workstation comprises the address of the second gateway (Fig. 27, paragraph [0128]).

Regarding claim 12, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the information transferred to the mobile workstation is transferred between the first gateway and the mobile workstation using an existing security association between the mobile workstation and the first gateway (elements "Reg Req 1, and Reg Rep 8 and authentication request message , AMR" interpreted as the information transferred to the mobile workstation is transferred between the first gateway and the mobile workstation; Fig. 27, paragraphs [0127]-[0129]).

Regarding claims 13, 15, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the second gateway comprises one or more databases which are updated to enable the internal portion of the network and the mobile workstation in the external portion of the network to communicate via the second gateway ("element 34 VPN database"; Fig. 27, paragraphs [0128], [0129]).

Regarding claim 17, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed further comprising location detection means for detecting the location of the mobile workstation and initiating a change in the point through which the mobile workstation communicates with the internal portion of the network, from the first gateway to a better gateway (element 33 AAAH" interpreted as the location detection means; Fig. 25, Fig.26, paragraphs [0119]-[0121]).

Regarding claim 18, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the gateway is better because it is closer to the mobile workstation and/or it is optimal for routing existing sessions (Fig. 13, paragraphs [0080], [0081]).

Regarding claim 19, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the detection means is responsive to a location identifier received from the mobile workstation (paragraphs [0128], [0100]).

Regarding claim 20, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the location identifier is the care-of-address of the mobile workstation ("care-of-address"; paragraph [0100]).

Regarding claim 21, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the identifier is received during a mobility binding update (Fig. 20, "mobility binding"; paragraphs 0098], [0101]).

Regarding claim 22, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the location detection means is separate from the first gateway ("element 33 AAAH" interpreted as the location detection means is separate from the first gateway (VPHGW(HA) interpreted as first gateway); Fig. 25, Fig.26, paragraphs [0119]-[0121]).

Regarding claim 23, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the transfer means is physically separate from the first gateway and wherein the location detection means and transfer means are housed together (Fig. 6, paragraphs [0071], [0072]).

Regarding claim 24, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the first gateway and the second gateway are in distinct physically separated

segments of the network (VPNGW(FA) interpreted as first gateway which is located at roaming-contracted ISP network, and VPNGW(HA) interpreted as second gateway which is located at HOME ISP; Fig. 25, Fig. 26).

Regarding claim 25, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the mobile workstation communicates with the internal portion of the network via the first gateway and also via the second gateway simultaneously for a transition period, before communicating via the second gateway only (Fig. 26, paragraphs [0120]-[0121]).

Regarding claim 26, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the mobile workstation is involved in a session with a correspondent node (paragraph [0128]).

Regarding claim 27, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the correspondent node is located in the internal portion of the network and the mobile workstation is located in the external portion of the network ("CN" interpreted as correspondent node is located in the internal portion of the network; "MN 1" interpreted as the mobile workstation is located in the external portion of the network; Fig. 2, Fig. 26).

Regarding claim 28, Kakemizu et al. disclose a method of optimizing the route by which information travels between a mobile node in an external portion of a network and a correspondent node in an internal portion of a network (Fig. 13, paragraph [0080]), comprising the steps of: determining when a first serving gateway through which the mobile node communicates with the internal portion of the network, is sub-optimal (Fig. 13, paragraph [0081]); identifying a second gateway; and transferring the point through which the mobile node communicates with the internal portion of the network from the first serving gateway to the second gateway (paragraph [0082]).

Regarding claim 29, Kakemizu et al. disclose a mobile workstation for connecting to an external portion of a network that includes an internal secured portion connected, via a first gateway and a second gateway to the external portion (Fig. 2, "element 21 VPNGW(FA)" interpreted as a first gateway, "element 31 VPNGW(HA)" interpreted as a second gateway, "VPN of IP sec." interpreted as internal secured portion, "public IP network" interpreted as an external portion; Fig. 2, paragraph [0017], Fig. 25, paragraphs [0113]), comprising: means arranged to receive, via the first secure communication means, an identifier of a second gateway (Fig. 27, paragraph [0128]); and means arranged to change from communicating with the internal portion of the network through the first gateway to communicating via the second gateway (Fig. 27, paragraphs [0128]-[0129]).

Regarding claim 30, Kakemizu et al. disclose a mobile workstation as claimed further comprising means for using a first secure communication means by which information is transferable securely between the internal portion of the network and the mobile workstation via the first gateway, to receive the identifier of the second gateway (elements "Reg Req 1, and Reg Rep 8 and authentication request message , AMR" interpreted as the information transferred to the mobile workstation is transferred between the first gateway and the mobile workstation; Fig. 27, paragraphs [0127]-[0129]);

Regarding claim 31, Kakemizu et al. discloses a mobile workstation as claimed further comprising means for using a second secure communication means to transfer information securely between the internal portion of the network and the mobile workstation via the second gateway (Fig. 27, "position registration request message (HAR), and "position registration response (HAA)" interpreted as means for using a second secure communication means; paragraphs [0128], [0129]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

10. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

11. Claims 14, 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kakemizu et al. (US 20020018456 A1) in view of Shapira et al. (US 7107464 B2).

Regarding claims 14, 16, Kakemizu et al. disclose a network as claimed wherein the second gateway comprises one or more databases ("element 34 VPN database"; Fig. 27, paragraphs [0128], [0129]).

Kakemizu et al. do not disclose explicitly wherein the one or more databases are a Security Policy Database and a Security Association Database.

Shapira et al. in the same field of endeavor teach wherein the one or more databases are a Security Policy Database and a Security Association Database ("a security association database (SAD)"; col. 6, lines 47 – 54, "Security Policy Database (SPD)"; col. 14, lines 39 – 48).

At time the invention was made it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Kakemizu et al. to include the features of wherein the one or more databases are a Security Policy Database and a Security Association Database as taught by Shapira et al. One of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to do so for providing a mechanism for implementing virtual private networks (VPNs) incorporating a security association database and associated processor (as suggested by Shapira et al., see col. 1, lines 8 – 11).

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- a) Jing et al. (US 7298847 B2).
- b) Xu et al. (US 6738362 B1).
- c) Amin et al. (US 6714987 B1).

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew C. Lee whose telephone number is (571)272-3131. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30am - 5:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Edan Orgad can be reached on (571) 272-7884. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Andrew C Lee/
Examiner, Art Unit 2619
<8/28/2008>

Art Unit: 2619

/Edan Orgad/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2619